

Before The
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

ORIGINAL
FILE

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

OCT 13 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of
Advanced Television Systems
and Their Impact upon the
Existing Television Broadcast
Service

) MM Docket No. 87-268
)
)
)
)

To: The Commission:

COMMENTS OF BRADENTON BROADCAST TELEVISION COMPANY, LTD.

On August 14, 1992, the Commission released its Second Further Notice Of Proposed Rule Making ("SFNPR") in the above referenced proceeding. Bradenton Broadcast Television Company, Ltd., Permittee of Television Station WTBG-TV in Bradenton, Florida ("BBTC"), by its counsel, pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's Rules, hereby files the following Comments on matters addressed in the SFNPR:

I. BBTC's INTEREST

BBTC is presently authorized to construct and operate a television station on UHF channel 66 in Bradenton, Florida under the existing NTSC system. As such it would also be eligible to apply for an additional authorization to operate a new television station on a new channel allocated to Bradenton in the proposed Advanced Television ("ATV") system when that new Table of Allocations is adopted. It is therefore an interested party in the instant proceeding.

No. of Copies rec'd 085
List A B C D E

II. THE PROPOSED ATV TABLE OF ALLOCATIONS REFLECTS
A LOGICAL APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW
ATV SERVICE AND SHOULD BE ADOPTED

In Comments previously filed in this proceeding in response to an earlier Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, BBTC expressed its concerns as to the formulation of the new ATV Table of Allocations and suggested that it be done on a 'whole market' approach i.e. that when new channel allocations were made, that they would be made to a whole ADI market which would also include communities with licensed or authorized facilities lying outside of a large central city but within the overall ADI market of that city. In paragraph 34 of the SFNPR the Commission responded to that concern and indicated that, in the Commission's judgment, such a 'whole market' approach would limit their flexibility in devising the Table of Allocations and would therefore be objectionable on that basis.

The Commission then proceeded to issue its Sample Table which was prepared in accordance with the guidelines and considerations as set forth and discussed in the SFNPR and as a part thereof, proceeded inter alia to allocate channel 42 as the ATV channel for use by the Bradenton permittee. BBTC recognizes the complexity inherent in preparation of the new ATV Table of Allocations and that the Table represents the final result of substantial technical analyses and computations necessary to generate a Table to cover all allocations for markets across the entire country.

Given the complexity, it appears manifest that no change could be proposed or adopted in that Table without in turn causing substantial changes in other allocations throughout the table. Accordingly, it would appear that the Table as presently computed and set forth in the SFNPR would represent the most logical approach to commencement of the new ATV service and should be adopted as such and that no changes in that Table should be considered unless it can be shown by the proponent thereof that the change would meet all required mileage separations and could be accomplished without affecting any other existing allocation in the Table.

In sum, BBTC appreciates the Commission's comments and concerns relative to the 'whole market' approach that had been previously suggested by BBTC and does not dispute the allocation now made in the Table included in the SFNPR directly to Bradenton. Further, as the only permittee in Bradenton, BBTC fully intends that at the appropriate time, consistent with the Commission's time schedule, it will apply for a construction permit and license to build and operate a new ATV station on that channel.

III. RESOLUTION OF INTERFERENCE CONSIDERATIONS BETWEEN NEW ATV OPERATIONS AND EXISTING ADJACENT CHANNEL NTSC STATIONS

It is noted that the Commission has proposed allocation of ATV channel 67 to St. Petersburg for eventual use at 'site 1' by one of the St. Petersburg stations. In making that allocation, the Commission was obviously mindful that BBTC would by that time

be operating its existing NTSC service upon adjacent channel 66. In its SFNPR at paragraph 28 the Commission discussed the spacing it would observe between ATV and NTSC adjacent channel stations and indicated that the minimum spacings would be "more than 88 km (55 miles) or less than 8 km (5 miles)". In BBTC's case, the situation would obviously be the latter i.e. the location of BBTC's channel 66 (NTSC) and the new proposed St. Petersburg channel 67 (ATV) would be within 5 miles of each other.

Although the Commission assumes that a location so close between adjacent channel operations would cancel out interference between the two stations and that there may be some theoretical support for that position, BBTC is nonetheless most concerned that the practical effect of initiation of an ATV service on channel 67 while BBTC is still operating its existing service on channel 66 (NTSC) will be destructive interference to the BBTC signal, if not on a broad basis, then by creating pockets of interference or alternating signal at various places within the BBTC coverage area.

While we are mindful that any such interference would be of a specified limited duration (ending when the changeover from NTSC to ATV service was completed and all existing NTSC licenses canceled) it nonetheless could require a coexistence of operation between the two channels for what would probably be a period of years. As such we would submit that it would be neither in the public interest nor consistent with the equitable rights of BBTC as an operating licensee on channel 66 for any degradation of

existing NTSC service on channel 66 to be caused by the initiation of service by the new ATV operator on channel 67.

We would therefore request that the Commission condition any permit for operation of a new ATV authorization on adjacent channel 67 to require that the new permittee take whatever actions as may be necessary to preclude any such interference to the existing adjacent channel operation by BBTC on channel 66 and that the new ATV permittee shall bear the exclusive burden for assuring that no such interference will result from its initiation of that new operation.

IV. CONVERSION OF ALL TELEVISION SERVICE TO THE NEW ATV SERVICE ON THE INTEGRATED UHF BAND IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

As noted in the SFNPR the Commission is planning to convert the present fragmented VHF/UHF television spectrum into a single UHF television band upon conversion to ATV. The change is too logical to be seriously disputed and is long overdue. Once the transition has been completed the benefits and economies of single band operation in design of tuners and receiving equipment and the freeing of the VHF band for other spectrum use will be clearly recognized.

As presently set forth, the Commission notes in paragraph 55 that only 17 of the proposed new ATV allotments might need (at least temporarily) to use some part of the VHF band but that even in these few cases, there are presently assigned UHF frequencies (for NTSC operations) allocated in each such community and that these existing UHF frequencies would generally meet ATV spacing

requirements and could be converted from NTSC to ATV operations. Clearly such a conversion of the channels in those cases from NTSC to ATV would be in the public interest and in so doing, would effectively complete the all-UHF ATV television band as proposed. We would support such channel conversion in these 17 communities as logical and consistent with the ultimate goal of replacing the current two-band NTSC television service with a single simplified one-band transmission providing the American Public with superior television service.

IV. CONCLUSION

In sum, consistent with the comments as set forth herein, Bradenton Broadcast Television Company, Ltd., supports the proposals as suggested in the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and submits that it and the accompanying Sample Table of ATV Television Allocations should be adopted as proposed.

BRADENTON BROADCAST TELEVISION
COMPANY, LTD.

by


Robert J. Buenzle

Its Counsel

Law Offices
Robert J. Buenzle
12110 Sunset Hills Road
Suite 450
Reston, Virginia 22090
(703) 715-3006

October 13, 1992